

REMARKS

This paper is responsive to the Final Office Action mailed November 5, 2010. This Response addresses each of the issues raised by the examiner in the Office Action. This Response accompanies a timely filed Request for Reconsideration (RCE). Accordingly entry of this Response and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Status of the Claims

Claims 1-17, 20, 22-30 and 32-34 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 20, 26 and 30 are independent claims. Claims 1-17, 20, 22-30 and 32-34 have been rejected under §103 as being obvious over the combination of Meyer, Van Dort, Silver, Matrix Vision and Guha. Applicant addresses these rejections in view of the declaration under rule 1.131 and accompanying evidence submitted herewith, which establishes invention prior to the effective date of the Guha reference.

Declaration under 37 C.F.R. 1.131

Applicant submits a supplementary declaration under rule 1.131 to swear behind the Guha reference by establishing prior invention. The Guha reference is relied upon for teaching claimed subject matter in each independent claim. The effective filing date of the Guha reference is its filing date of February 9, 2001. Applicant provides supplemental evidence herewith, in addition to the declaration, of an email communication showing release notes that were created on January 31, 2001. This further supports that the claimed invention was conceived and reduced to practice at least by January 31, 2001, which is prior to the effective date of Guha.

As described in the “Release Notes” provided herewith in the email communication, the link function in operation permits a user to jump between spreadsheets of systems on the network. This is analogous to the “link function” as claimed by Applicant. Further, the Release Notes state that at least one task is performed upon execution of the link. Thus, the execution link and tasks performed upon execution were clearly conceived and reduced to practice at least by January 31, 2001. This evidence further supports the original evidence in that the link function was at least conceived and reduced to practice on or before October 6, 2000.

The original “first” piece of evidence provided to support the declaration includes the screen printout of the link function being reduced to practice “add link function”, which was provided with the original declaration filed in September 27, 2010. This clearly shows that Applicant’s link function was conceived and reduced to practice by at least October 6, 2000. All of the evidence clearly shows that Applicant conceived of and reduced to practice the elements prior to the effective date of Guha. Given that Applicant has reduced to practice and invented prior to the effective date of Guha, Applicants claims are not obvious over the combination of references, which include Guha.

The claims should now be in condition for allowance with each of the objections and/or rejections being addressed or traversed. Accordingly applicant respectfully requests the examiner to issue a Notice of Allowance at the earliest possible date.

Should any unresolved issues remain that require further attention, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone the undersigned attorney for applicant at 603-336-3026 so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible.

Please charge any fee or fee deficiency that is otherwise unpaid to Deposit Account
Number 504479.

Respectfully Submitted,



William A. Loginov
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 34863

William A. Loginov
10 Water Street
Concord, NH 03301-4844
Tel. 603-336-3026